

Message

From: Griffiths, Rachel [griffiths.rachel@epa.gov]
Sent: 8/30/2017 8:39:43 PM
To: Donovan, Betsy [Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov]; Vaughn, Stephanie [Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov]; Kaur, Supinderjit [Kaur.Supinderjit@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Rolling Knolls - proposed agenda for August 31 meeting

I will add my notes to this matrix in another color. I think #87 was also CDM but we discussed that the response and updated cross section are sufficient.

From: Donovan, Betsy
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2017 4:12 PM
To: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>; Griffiths, Rachel <griffiths.rachel@epa.gov>; Kaur, Supinderjit <Kaur.Supinderjit@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Rolling Knolls - proposed agenda for August 31 meeting

This just in.... Please take a look and let me know if we should discuss these in more detail Thanks!

From: Hagerman, Paul [mailto:HagermanPR@cdmsmith.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2017 4:04 PM
To: Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>; Darpinian, Amy F NWK (Amy.F.Darpinian@usace.army.mil) <Amy.F.Darpinian@usace.army.mil>
Subject: RE: Rolling Knolls - proposed agenda for August 31 meeting

Betsy –

We added a column to the PRPs table, and added our response to their responses. In most cases, we are ok with their response or suggested approach. If you'd like, we can talk today, we should be here until 5:30.

Paul Hagerman, P.E.
CDM Smith
110 Fieldcrest Avenue, #8
6th Floor
Edison, NJ 08837
phone: (732) 225 7000 (operator)
phone: (732) 590 4663 (direct dial)
cell phone: (917) 941 4010

From: Donovan, Betsy [mailto:Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2017 5:35 PM
To: Hagerman, Paul <HagermanPR@cdmsmith.com>; Darpinian, Amy F NWK (Amy.F.Darpinian@usace.army.mil) <Amy.F.Darpinian@usace.army.mil>; Jill McKenzie (Jill.McKenzie@dep.nj.gov) <Jill.McKenzie@dep.nj.gov>; Fajardo, Juan <Fajardo.Juan@epa.gov>; Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>; George Molnar (George.Molnar@fws.gov) <George.Molnar@fws.gov>
Subject: FW: Rolling Knolls - proposed agenda for August 31 meeting

FYI and just in case this didn't make it to you while I was out.

From: John Persico [mailto:JPersico@Geosyntec.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2017 4:45 PM

To: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>; Kaur, Supinderjit <Kaur.Supinderjit@epa.gov>; Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>

Cc: Jessica M. Evans <JMEvans@Geosyntec.com>; Ricci, Richard F. <RRicci@lowenstein.com>; mfaigen@issuesllc.com; 'Fisher, Gary (Nokia - US/Murray Hill)' <gary.fisher@nokia.com>; 'Richman-La Londe, Alexa' <ALALONDE@RIKER.com>; Michael Draikiwicz <MDraikiwicz@enviro-sciences.com>; 'Shawn LaTourette' <SLaTourette@gibbonslaw.com>; 'Irvin M. Freilich' <IFreilich@gibbonslaw.com>; 'Goldfarb, Steven' <steven.goldfarb@novartis.com>; Truedinger, Robb <robb.truedinger@novartis.com>; 'Sofina Mirza-Reid' <sofina.mirza-reid@novartis.com>; Adame Winningham, Nikki <nadame@lowenstein.com>; 'Brian Bergeron' <pete.bergeron@chevron.com>; 'Richard T. Hughes' <rhughes@iw.com>

Subject: Rolling Knolls - proposed agenda for August 31 meeting

Betsy and Stephanie – this email provides a proposed agenda for the upcoming meeting on August 31. I have also attached the USEPA comments we want to discuss, with preliminary responses or questions from the PRP Group.

Proposed Agenda

1. Discussion of USEPA Comments on the Revised Remedial Investigation Report (April 2017)

- General Comments

- Comments 1, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, and 39 – meaning and applicability of delineation in the RIR; discussion of “areas of particular concern” and “potential source areas;” use of these concepts in the FS rather than the RIR.
- Comments 2, 23, 24, and 28 – use of Background Threshold Values.
- Comment 12 – request clarification as to why USEPA is requesting this change
- Comments 14, 28, 29, 32, and 38 – request clarification as to what USEPA is asking for in these comments.
- Comment 20 – no evidence of spent granular activated carbon at test pit TP-09.
- Comment 36 – comparison of soil data to IGWSSLs in the FS.
- Comment 41 – conclusion is valid based on the data and should remain in the text.

- Specific Comments

- Comments 35 and 43 – question whether the information requested is relevant to the Executive Summary; it does not seem at a high enough level for the Executive Summary.
- Comments 64, 68, 73, and 97 – USEPA to verify our responses.
- Comments 79 and 82 – delineation of the landfill boundary.
- Comments 84, 87, 92, 116, 130, 134, 173, and 196 – these comments request additional text to discuss various aspects of the site hydrogeology, contaminant distribution, and other issues. However, these data are already discussed fully in the text. Additional discussion will become speculative or repetitive.
- Comment 102 – the samples are from 2007 and these data were included in the 2012 SCSR with no comment by USEPA. Finding out why they were reanalyzed would require a data validator to review the old lab reports. Other than adding one sentence to the RIR to state why they were reanalyzed, there will be no valuable addition to the RIR.
- Comment 197 – was addressed in Section 4.5.4 of the April 2017 Revised RIR.

2. Application of ARSs to Define Remediation Areas in the Feasibility Study

- Use of Compliance Averaging
- Averaging for PCB data

3. Overall Project Direction

4. Schedule – deliverables leading to the ROD

We look forward to speaking with you on the 31st.

John L. Persico, P.G.
Principal
609 493 9008 (office)
609 903 6227 (cell)



engineers | scientists | innovators